arXiv:1206.4836v2 [quant-ph] 3 May 2013

Deduction of an upper bound on the success probability of port-based teleportation from the no-cloning theorem and the no-signaling principle

Damián Pitalúa-García
Centre for Quantum Information and Foundations, DAMTP,
Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge,
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, United Kingdom

In port-based teleportation, Alice teleports an unknown quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ to one of N ports at Bob's site. Alice applies a measurement and sends Bob the outcome k. Bob only needs to select the kth port in order to obtain $|\psi\rangle$. We present a theorem in the spirit of the no-cloning theorem, which says that it is impossible to extract any information from an unknown quantum state if only a single copy of it is provided and if the state remains unchanged. We use this theorem and the no-signaling principle to prove an upper bound on the success probability of port-based teleportation.

Quantum teleportation [1] is a fundamental protocol of quantum information theory in which an unknown quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ is destroyed at its original location by Alice and reconstructed at another location by Bob. The protocol works as follows: Alice and Bob must initially share a maximally entangled state, Alice applies a Bell measurement to her systems, she communicates her measurement outcome to Bob, who then applies a unitary correction operation according to Alice's message.

Here, we consider a different type of teleportation protocol, which we refer to as *port-based teleportation* (PBT). PBT was devised by Ishizaka and Hiroshima [2, 3] with the purpose of implementing a universal programmable quantum processor that succeeds with probability arbitrarily close to unity; this task can be achieved using standard teleportation, too, but with a very small success probability for input states of big dimension [4].

In this paper we consider general PBT protocols, which allow Alice to teleport an unknown quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ to one of N ports at Bob's site. PBT requires that Alice and Bob share quantum entanglement and consists of the following steps. Alice applies a measurement with outcome $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$; if $k = 0$, teleportation fails, otherwise $|\psi\rangle$ is teleported to the kth port. Alice communicates k to Bob, who then discards the states at ports with indexes distinct from k. No further correction operations are required; this advantage over standard teleportation makes PBT useful in various quantum information tasks. In the probabilistic version of PBT, $|\psi\rangle$ is teleported perfectly but with a success probability $p < 1$; in the deterministic version, outcome $k = 0$ never occurs but the fidelity of the teleported state is smaller than unity [2, 3].

Besides its use as a universal programmable quantum processor, PBT can be used to implement instantaneous nonlocal quantum computation (INLC), reducing exponentially the amount of needed entanglement compared to schemes based on standard teleportation [5]. INLC is the application of a nonlocal unitary operation U on a state $|\psi\rangle$ shared by two or more distant parties with a single round of classical communication (CC). If two rounds of CC are allowed, U can be implemented trivially as follows: Alice teleports her part of $|\psi\rangle$ to Bob, who then applies U to $|\psi\rangle$, now in his location, and then teleports Alice's share of the state back to her. However, it is not trivial to complete this task with only one round of CC. It was Vaidman [6] who first showed how to implement this task using a recursive scheme based on standard teleportation, which consumes an amount of entanglement growing double exponentially with the number of qubits n of the input state $|\psi\rangle$. However, a scheme by Beigi and König [5] based on PBT allows the implementation of INLC with an amount of entanglement growing only exponentially with n.

INLC has application to other distributed quantum tasks: it allows the implementation of instantaneous nonlocal measurements (INLM) and also breaks the security of position-based quantum cryptography (PBQC) and some quantum tagging schemes [7–12]. INLM is the measurement of a nonlocal observable in a distributed quantum state with a single round of CC [6, 13–15]. Quantum tagging [7–9, 16] and PBQC [11, 12] are cryptographic tasks that rely on quantum information processing and relativistic constraints with the goals of verifying the location of an object and providing secure communication with a party at a given location, respectively.

It is interesting to investigate the limitations and possibilities on quantum information processing tasks that can be derived directly from no-signaling (NS) and other fundamental principles of quantum theory. Some important results obtained with this approach are the following: the maximum fidelity achieved by quantum cloning machines can be deduced from NS [17], security of quantum key distribution can be guaranteed as long as NS is satisfied [18], and the recently discovered information causality principle [19] implies Tsirelson's bound on the amount of nonlocality for quantum correlations.

In this paper, we show an upper bound on the success probability of probabilistic PBT of a n-qubit state from the no-cloning theorem and the no-signaling principle:

$$p \leq \frac{N}{4^n + N - 1}. \tag{1}$$

Our bound agrees with the maximum success probability obtained in [3] for the particular case $n = 1$:

$$p_{\max} = \frac{N}{3+N}. \tag{2}$$

Thus, we confirm the hypothesis presented in [3] that Eq. (2) can be derived from fundamental laws of physics. It is an interesting open problem to find a probabilistic PBT protocol for the case $n > 1$ and to see whether our bound is achievable.

Comparing Eqs. (1) and (2), we see that $(p_{\max})^n$ can be bigger than the upper bound on p, which means that applying PBT individually to each qubit of $|\psi\rangle$ can give a higher success probability than applying PBT globally to $|\psi\rangle$. However, we justify the restriction that $|\psi\rangle$ must be localized to a single port by noting that the advantage of PBT as described here, at least for implementing a universal programmable quantum processor and INLC, is that, before receiving Alice's message, Bob can apply the desired quantum operation to the state at every port, after which, $|\psi\rangle$ is transformed as desired. Clearly, this advantage is lost if the qubits of $|\psi\rangle$ spread among different ports.

Before summarizing our proof of Eq. (1), it will be useful to give a general description of the PBT protocol. For simplicity of the exposition we consider a pure input state $|\psi\rangle_a \in \mathcal{H}_a$. Due to the linearity of quantum theory, the protocol works for mixed states too. Alice and Bob share a fixed entangled state $|\xi\rangle_{AB} \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, which is independent of $|\psi\rangle$ because this is arbitrary and unknown. Bob has N ports $\{B_j\}_{j=1}^N$, hence $\mathcal{H}_B = \bigotimes_{j=1}^N \mathcal{H}_{B_j}$, where $\dim\mathcal{H}_{B_j} = \dim\mathcal{H}_a = 2^n \ \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. System A includes any ancilla held by Alice and so has an arbitrarily big dimension. However, in [2, 3], $\mathcal{H}_A = \bigotimes_{j=1}^N \mathcal{H}_{A_j}$ and $\dim\mathcal{H}_{A_j} = \dim\mathcal{H}_a \ \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. We follow a notation in which subindex a is written in $|\psi\rangle_a$ only when we wish to emphasize that the system a is in state $|\psi\rangle$, similarly for other states and systems. The initial global state is

$$|G\rangle_{aAB} = |\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_{AB}. \tag{3}$$

Alice applies a generalized measurement, which in general can be decomposed into a unitary operation U acting jointly on a and A, followed by a projective measurement. Alice obtains outcome $k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ with probability $q_k > 0$ and $k = 0$ with probability $1 - \sum_{k=1}^N q_k$. If $k \neq 0$, the global state is transformed into

$$|G_k\rangle_{aAB} = |\psi\rangle_{B_k}|R_k\rangle_{aA\tilde{B}_k}, \tag{4}$$

where $\tilde{B}_k \equiv B_1 B_2 \cdots B_{k-1} B_{k+1} B_{k+2} \cdots B_N$, so state $|\psi\rangle$ is teleported to port B_k. However, if $k = 0$, PBT fails; in this case we denote the final state as

$$|G_0\rangle_{aAB} = |F^{(\psi)}\rangle_{aAB}. \tag{5}$$

The total success probability is

$$p \equiv \sum_{j=1}^N q_j. \tag{6}$$

Now we are able to summarize the proof. First, we present a version of the no-cloning theorem, which allows us to show that the probabilities q_k and states $|R_k\rangle$ cannot depend on $|\psi\rangle$, while the state $|F^{(\psi)}\rangle$ must do, as the notation suggests. Second, we use the no-signaling principle to show that the state $\hat{\eta}_j$ of port B_j before implementing PBT must be of the form

$$\hat{\eta}_j = q_j|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \sum_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq j}}^N q_i\hat{\gamma}_{j,i} + (1-p)\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)}, \tag{7}$$

where $\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}$ and $\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)}$ are the states to which B_j transforms into after outcomes $k = i \notin \{0, j\}$ and $k = 0$ are obtained, respectively. Since $\hat{\eta}_j$, $\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}$ and $\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)}$ are reduced states of $|\xi\rangle$, $|R_i\rangle$ and $|F^{(\psi)}\rangle$, respectively, $\hat{\eta}_j$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}$ do not depend on $|\psi\rangle$, while $\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)}$ does. Third, we use the independence of these states from $|\psi\rangle$ and Eq. (7) to show that if there exists a protocol that achieves success probability q_j for some states $\hat{\eta}_j$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}$ then there exists a protocol satisfying

$$\hat{\eta}_j = \hat{\gamma}_{j,i} = \frac{I}{2^n}, \tag{8}$$

which achieves the same success probability. Fourth, we assume Eq. (8) and present a protocol in which Alice tries to send Bob a random message of $2n$ bits. This protocol combines the superdense coding protocol [20] and a modified PBT protocol in which Alice holds every port except for B_j, which is held by Bob, but does not allow communication. We show that this protocol succeeds with probability

$$p'_j = q_j + \frac{1}{4^n}(p - q_j) + (1-p)r_j, \tag{9}$$

for some probability r_j. Since there is not communication in such a protocol, the no-signaling principle implies that Bob cannot obtain any information about Alice's message. This means that Bob can only obtain the correct message with the probability of making a random guess: $p'_j = 4^{-n}$ [21]. Thus, we have

$$q_j + \frac{1}{4^n}(p - q_j) + (1-p)r_j = \frac{1}{4^n}. \tag{10}$$

Summing over $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and using Eq. (6), we obtain that $p = f_{n,N}(R)$, where $R \equiv \sum_{j=1}^N r_j$ and $f_{n,N}(R) \equiv \left(1 + \frac{4^n-1}{N-4^nR}\right)^{-1}$. It is straightforward to obtain that the condition $0 \leq p \leq 1$ is satisfied only if

$R \le 4^{-n}N$. Since the function $f_{n,N}(R)$ decreases monotonically with R in the range $[0, 4^{-n}N]$, we have that $f_{n,N}(R) \le f_{n,N}(0) = N/(N + 4^n - 1)$. Thus, we obtain the desired bound,

$$p \le \frac{N}{4^n + N - 1}.$$

We continue with the arguments of the proof.

The following theorem is in the spirit of the no-cloning theorem [22, 23], in a probabilistic [24] and a stronger [25] version, and tells us that it is impossible to extract any information from a single copy of an unknown quantum state without modifying it.

Theorem. *Consider a single copy of an unknown pure quantum state* $|\psi\rangle_a \in \mathcal{H}_a$ *and a fixed initial state* $|\xi\rangle_b \in \mathcal{H}_b$ *of an auxiliary system of arbitrary dimension. A physical operation* O *that induces a transformation* T_k*:*

$$|\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b \longrightarrow |\psi\rangle_a|R_k^{(\psi)}\rangle_b,$$

with probability $q_k^{(\psi)} > 0$*, for* $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$*, and a transformation* T_0*:*

$$|\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b \longrightarrow |F^{(\psi)}\rangle_{ab},$$

with probability $1 - \sum_{k=1}^{N} q_k^{(\psi)}$*, for all* $|\psi\rangle_a \in \mathcal{H}_a$*, in which the index* $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ *of the induced transformation* T_j *is known after* O *is completed, is possible only if*

$$q_k^{(\psi)} = q_k^{(\phi)}, \quad |R_k^{(\psi)}\rangle_b = |R_k^{(\phi)}\rangle_b, \quad \langle F^{(\phi)}|F^{(\psi)}\rangle = \langle\phi|\psi\rangle,$$

for all $|\psi\rangle_a, |\phi\rangle_a \in \mathcal{H}_a$ *and* $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$*.*

The proof of the theorem is presented in the Supplemental Material. The theorem implies the following lemma.

Lemma. *In a PBT protocol, as described by Eqs. (3)–(5), for every input state* $|\psi\rangle_a$ *the following is true. The probability* q_k *of successful teleportation to port* B_k *and the residual state* $|R_k\rangle_{aA\tilde{B}_k}$ *when* $|\psi\rangle$ *is teleported to port* B_k *do not depend on* $|\psi\rangle$*. However, the global state* $|F^{(\psi)}\rangle_{aAB}$ *obtained after a failed PBT depends on* $|\psi\rangle$*.*

Proof. We can identify the physical operation O in the theorem with the PBT protocol described by Eqs. (3)–(5) followed by a swap operation of systems a and B_k when outcome $k \neq 0$ is obtained. Therefore, according to the theorem, the probability q_k and the state $|R_k\rangle$ in Eq. (4) do not depend on $|\psi\rangle$, while the state $|F^{(\psi)}\rangle$ in Eq. (5) does. ☐

The fact that the states $|R_k\rangle_{aA\tilde{B}_k}$ do not depend on $|\psi\rangle$, together with the fact that Alice knows the resource state $|\xi\rangle_{AB}$, her unitary U, her projective measurement, and its result k, implies that Alice knows the states $|R_k\rangle_{aA\tilde{B}_k}$. This will be useful later.

Now we prove Eq. (7). We consider the state $\hat{\eta}_j$ of system B_j held by Bob before the PBT protocol begins. From Eq. (3) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}_j \equiv& \operatorname{Tr}_{aA\tilde{B}_j}\left(|G\rangle\langle G|\right)_{aAB} \\ =& \operatorname{Tr}_{A\tilde{B}_j}\left(|\xi\rangle\langle\xi|\right)_{AB}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The no-signaling principle implies that from Bob's point of view, his state does not change with Alice's LO if she does not send him any information. However, from Alice's point of view, after she applies her LO, Bob's state changes according to her measurement result k.

1) With probability $q_j, k = j$ and $\hat{\eta}_j$ changes to $|\psi\rangle$, as can be seen from Eq. (4):

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{aA\tilde{B}_j}\left(|G_j\rangle\langle G_j|\right)_{aAB} = \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right)_{B_j}.$$

2) With probability q_i, $k = i \notin \{0, j\}$ and $\hat{\eta}_j$ changes to some state that we denote as $\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}$. From Eq. (4) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\gamma}_{j,i} \equiv& \operatorname{Tr}_{aA\tilde{B}_j}\left(|G_i\rangle\langle G_i|\right)_{aAB} \\ =& \operatorname{Tr}_{aA\tilde{B}_{j,i}}\left(|R_i\rangle\langle R_i|\right)_{aA\tilde{B}_i}, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\tilde{B}_{j,i} \equiv B_1 \cdots B_{j-1}B_{j+1} \cdots B_{i-1}B_{i+1} \cdots B_N$. In this case $|\psi\rangle$ is successfully teleported to port $B_i \neq B_j$.

3) With probability $1-p, k = 0$ and $\hat{\eta}_j$ changes to some state that we call $\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)}$. From Eq. (5) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)} \equiv& \operatorname{Tr}_{aA\tilde{B}_j}\left(|G_0\rangle\langle G_0|\right)_{aAB} \\ =& \operatorname{Tr}_{aA\tilde{B}_j}\left(|F^{(\psi)}\rangle\langle F^{(\psi)}|\right)_{aAB}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

This is the failure result, hence $\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)} \neq |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ in general.

Since $|\xi\rangle$ is fixed, we see from Eq. (11) that $\hat{\eta}_j$ does not depend on $|\psi\rangle$. Equations (12) and (13) and the lemma imply that q_j and $\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}$ do not depend on $|\psi\rangle$, while $\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)}$ does. Due to the no-signaling principle, Bob cannot learn Alice's outcome before he receives any information from her. Therefore, from Bob's point of view, before receiving any information from Alice, his state is

$$\hat{\eta}_j = q_j|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i\neq j}}^{N} q_i\hat{\gamma}_{j,i} + (1-p)\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)},$$

which is Eq. (7).

Now we show that if there exists a protocol that achieves success probability q_j for some states $\hat{\eta}_j$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}$ then there exists a protocol with corresponding states $\hat{\eta}'_j, \hat{\gamma}'_{j,i}$ and $\hat{\omega}'^{(\psi)}_j$ that achieves the same success probability and satisfies $\hat{\eta}'_j = \hat{\gamma}'_{j,i} = \frac{I}{2^n}$, that is, Eq. (8). The claimed protocol, which for convenience we call *primed*, is the following (see details in the Supplemental Material).

We define the set of unitary operations $\{V_l\}_{l=1}^{4^n} \equiv \{\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\}^{\otimes n}$, where σ_0 is the identity acting on $\mathbb{C}^2$

and $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^3$ are the Pauli matrices. We will use the identity

$$\frac{I}{2^n} \equiv \frac{1}{4^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n} V_l \hat{\rho} V_l^\dagger, \tag{14}$$

which is satisfied for any quantum state $\hat{\rho}$ of dimension 2^n. Consider an ancilla a' with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{a'}$ of dimension 4^n at Alice's site, which in general can be included as part of A, but which for clarity of the presentation is distinguished as a different system. Let $\{|\mu_l\rangle\}_{l=1}^{4^n}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{a'}$. The ancilla a' is prepared in the state $|\phi\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n}|\mu_l\rangle$. Conditioned on a' being in the state $|\mu_l\rangle$, the following operations are performed. Before implementing PBT, Bob's system B_j is prepared in the state $V_l\hat{\eta}_j V_l^\dagger$. Then, if Alice applies the PBT protocol described by Eqs. (3)–(5), which satisfies Eq. (7), on her system aA then with probability q_j the state of system B_j transforms into $V_l|\psi\rangle$ and with probability q_i transforms into $V_l\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}V_l^\dagger$, where $i \notin \{j, 0\}$; this is clear from Eq. (7) and follows from the fact that the operations on B_j commute with those on aA (no-signaling) and from the linearity of quantum theory (see details in the Supplemental Material). Thus, consider that before doing this, Alice applies $V_l^\dagger$ on her input state $|\psi\rangle_a$. In this case, the state $|\psi\rangle$ is teleported without error. Since the states of system B_j before implementing PBT and after an outcome $k = i \notin \{j, 0\}$ is obtained do not depend on the teleported state, these states remain the same. Hence, in the primed PBT protocol we obtain that after discarding the ancilla a', by taking the partial trace over $\mathcal{H}_{a'}$, the initial state of system B_j is $\hat{\eta}'_j = \frac{1}{4^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n} V_l\hat{\eta}_j V_l^\dagger$ and its final state after an outcome $k = i \notin \{j, 0\}$ is obtained is $\hat{\gamma}'_{j,i} = \frac{1}{4^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n} V_l\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}V_l^\dagger$, both of which equal $\frac{I}{2^n}$, as follows from Eq. (14). Therefore, we see from Eq. (7) that this protocol satisfies

$$\frac{I}{2^n} = q_j|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \sum_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} q_i\frac{I}{2^n} + (1-p)\hat{\omega}_j'^{(\psi)}, \tag{15}$$

where

$$\hat{\omega}_j'^{(\psi)} \equiv \frac{1}{4^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n} V_l\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi_l)}V_l^\dagger,$$

and ψ_l refers to dependence on the state $V_l^\dagger|\psi\rangle$.

We have shown that the previous PBT protocol succeeds with probability q_j and satisfies Eq. (8). Thus, we assume Eq. (8) in what follows, and without loss of generality we consider that the system a' is included in A, hence we do not need to mention it again.

Now we present a protocol in which Alice tries to send Bob a random message of $2n$ bits that succeeds with probability p'_j, given by Eq. (9). Note that so far we have considered the input system a to be in a pure state. However, the previous arguments work if a is in a mixed state too. Thus, consider that a is in a bipartite maximally entangled state with system b, held by Bob, and that Alice and Bob perform superdense cding (SDC) [20] using this state. Alice applies a local unitary on a that encodes a message of $2n$ bits, after which the system ab is in the state $|\psi\rangle_{ab}$. But, instead of sending system a directly to Bob, Alice teleports its state using the modified PBT protocol described below in which no communication is allowed. Bob completes SDC by measuring the system B_jb in an orthonormal basis that includes the state $|\psi\rangle$. Bob obtains Alice's message correctly if his outcome corresponds to the state $|\psi\rangle$.

Bob has the system B_jb and Alice has the system $aA\tilde{B}_j$. Similar to the original PBT protocol, the initial global state is given by $|\psi\rangle_{ab}|\xi\rangle_{AB}$, and Alice applies the same local operations (LO) on systems a and A, only. Therefore, if Alice's measurement result is $k \neq 0$, the final state is $|\psi\rangle_{B_kb}|R_k\rangle_{aA\tilde{B}_k}$ and the residual state $|R_k\rangle_{aA\tilde{B}_k}$ is known by her. However, *Alice is not allowed to communicate with Bob.* From Eq. (8), we assume that Bob's register B_j is initially in the completely mixed state, meaning that it is maximally entangled with its purifying system, at Alice's site. Consider the possible situations according to Alice's outcome k.

1) Alice obtains $k = j$, so the system B_jb is transformed into the state $|\psi\rangle_{B_jb}$; this occurs with probability q_j. Bob applies the SDC measurement and obtains Alice's message correctly.

2) Alice obtains $k = i \notin \{0, j\}$, so the state of system a is teleported to the register B_i at Alice's site; this occurs with probability q_i. We denote the composite system $aA\tilde{B}_{j,i}$ as $A_{j,i}$. Alice has the systems $A_{j,i}$ and B_i, while Bob has the system B_jb. The global system is in the state $|\psi\rangle_{B_ib}|R_i\rangle_{A_{j,i}B_j}$. Equation (8) tells us that the system B_j is completely mixed, meaning that it is maximally entangled with its purifying system $A_{j,i}$,

$$|R_i\rangle_{A_{j,i}B_j} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}\sum_{l=1}^{2^n}|l_i\rangle_{A_{j,i}}|l_i\rangle_{B_j},$$

where $\{|l_i\rangle\}_{l=1}^{2^n}$ is the Schmidt basis of $|R_i\rangle_{A_{j,i}B_j}$, which is known by Alice. Therefore, Alice can apply the LO of the standard teleportation protocol [1] to the systems B_i and $A_{j,i}$ in order to teleport the state of system B_i to system B_j. Then, Bob applies the SDC measurement on B_jb. Since communication is not allowed, the no-signaling principle implies that Bob obtains Alice's message correctly with probability 4^{-n}. Thus, if $k \notin \{0, j\}$, the success probability is

$$\frac{1}{4^n}\sum_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} q_i = \frac{1}{4^n}(p - q_j).$$

3) Alice obtains $k = 0$, hence the protocol fails; this occurs with probability $1-p$. In this case, we should allow for the possibility that the final state of the system $B_j b$ has nonzero overlap with the input state $|\psi\rangle$. Therefore, after applying the SDC measurement, the system $B_j b$ transforms into the state $|\psi\rangle_{B_j b}$ with some probability r_j. Thus, if $k = 0$, Bob obtains Alice's message with probability r_j.

The total success probability p'_j of the previous protocol is given by Eq. (9):

$$p'_j = q_j + \frac{1}{4^n}(p - q_j) + (1-p)r_j.$$

Thus, Eq. (10) and our main result, Eq. (1), follow.

In summary, we have shown an upper bound on the success probability p of probabilistic port-based teleportation (PBT) of an unknown quantum state of n qubits as a function of n and the number of ports N, Eq. (1). Our proof is based on the no-signaling principle and a version of the no-cloning theorem, which we have presented in this paper. Our bound on p agrees with the maximum success probability for the case $n = 1$ [3]. A probabilistic PBT protocol for the case $n > 1$ has not been developed explicitly; it would be interesting to know whether our bound can be achieved in this case too.

I would like to thank Adrian Kent for much assistance with this work and Tony Short for helpful discussions. I acknowledge financial support from CONACYT México and partial support from Gobierno de Veracruz.

[1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).

[2] S. Ishizaka and T. Hiroshima, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 240501 (2008).

[3] S. Ishizaka and T. Hiroshima, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 042306 (2009).

[4] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 321 (1997).

[5] S. Beigi and R. König, New J. Phys. **13**, 093036 (2011).

[6] L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 010402 (2003).

[7] A. Kent, R. Beausoleil, W. Munro, and T. Spiller, US Patent No. 7,075,438 (2006).

[8] R. A. Malaney, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042319 (2010); (2010), arXiv:1004.4689.

[9] A. Kent, W. J. Munro, and T. P. Spiller, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 012326 (2011).

[10] H. K. Lau and H. K. Lo, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 012322 (2011).

[11] H. Buhrman, N. Chandran, S. Fehr, R. Gelles, V. Goyal, R. Ostrovsky, and C. Schaffner, (2011), arXiv:1009.2490.

[12] H. Buhrman, S. Fehr, C. Schaffner, and F. Speelman, in *Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science* (ACM, New York, 2013), pp. 145–158.

[13] B. Groisman and B. Reznik, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 022110 (2002).

[14] B. Groisman, B. Reznik, and L. Vaidman, J. Mod. Opt. **50**, 943 (2003).

[15] S. R. Clark, A. J. Connor, D. Jaksch, and S. Popescu, New J. Phys. **12**, 083034 (2010).

[16] A. Kent, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 022335 (2011).

[17] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **242**, 1 (1998).

[18] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010503 (2005).

[19] M. Pawłowski, T. Paterek, D. Kaszlikowski, V. Scarani, A. Winter, and M. Żukowski, Nature (London) **461**, 1101 (2009).

[20] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2881 (1992).

[21] It is not possible that $p'_j < 4^{-n}$, because this would imply that a modified protocol in which Bob applies a permutation to the obtained message succeeds with a probability higher than 4^{-n}, violating the no-signaling principle.

[22] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, Nature (London) **299**, 802 (1982).

[23] D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A **92**, 271 (1982).

[24] J. Barrett, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032304 (2007).

[25] R. Jozsa, (2002), arXiv:quant-ph/0204153; (2003), arXiv:quant-ph/0305114.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Proof of the theorem

Theorem. *Consider a single copy of an unknown pure quantum state* $|\psi\rangle_a \in \mathcal{H}_a$ *and a fixed initial state* $|\xi\rangle_b \in \mathcal{H}_b$ *of an auxiliary system of arbitrary dimension. A physical operation* O *that induces a transformation* T_k*:*

$$|\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b \longrightarrow |\psi\rangle_a|R_k^{(\psi)}\rangle_b,$$

with probability $q_k^{(\psi)} > 0$*, for* $k \in \{1,2,\ldots,N\}$*, and a transformation* T_0*:*

$$|\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b \longrightarrow |F^{(\psi)}\rangle_{ab},$$

with probability $1-\sum_{k=1}^N q_k^{(\psi)}$*, for all* $|\psi\rangle_a \in \mathcal{H}_a$*, in which the index* $j \in \{0,1,\ldots,N\}$ *of the induced transformation* T_j *is known after* O *is completed, is possible only if*

$$q_k^{(\psi)} = q_k^{(\phi)}, \quad |R_k^{(\psi)}\rangle_b = |R_k^{(\phi)}\rangle_b, \quad \langle F^{(\phi)}|F^{(\psi)}\rangle = \langle\phi|\psi\rangle,$$

for all $|\psi\rangle_a, |\phi\rangle_a \in \mathcal{H}_a$ *and* $k \in \{1,2,\ldots,N\}$*.*

Proof. In general, the physical operation O can be decomposed into a unitary operation U acting on the input system and an ancilla of sufficiently big dimension, followed by a projective measurement. Without loss of generality we can consider that the measurement is made on a pointer system π of dimension $N+1$, with the outcome indicating the induced transformation. Let $|\chi\rangle_\pi \in \mathcal{H}_\pi$ be a fixed initial state of π and $\{|k\rangle_\pi\}_{k=0}^{N}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_\pi$. U must be such that

$$U|\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b|\chi\rangle_\pi = \sqrt{1-p^{(\psi)}}|F^{(\psi)}\rangle_{ab}|0\rangle_\pi + \sum_{k=1}^{N}\sqrt{q_k^{(\psi)}}|\psi\rangle_a|R_k^{(\psi)}\rangle_b|k\rangle_\pi, \tag{16}$$

where $p^{(\psi)} \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{N} q_k^{(\psi)}$. Let $\mathcal{H}_a$ have dimension d, $\{|e_l\rangle_a\}_{l=1}^{d}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_a$ and the expansion of $|\psi\rangle_a$ in this basis be

$$|\psi\rangle_a = \sum_{l=1}^{d}\alpha_l|e_l\rangle_a. \tag{17}$$

Applying Eq. (16) to state $|e_l\rangle_a$ we have

$$U|e_l\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b|\chi\rangle_\pi = \sqrt{1-p^{(e_l)}}|F^{(e_l)}\rangle_{ab}|0\rangle_\pi + \sum_{k=1}^{N}\sqrt{q_k^{(e_l)}}|e_l\rangle_a|R_k^{(e_l)}\rangle_b|k\rangle_\pi. \tag{18}$$

On the one hand, Eqs. (17), (18) and the linearity of unitary evolution imply that

$$U|\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b|\chi\rangle_\pi = \sum_{l=1}^{d}\alpha_l\sqrt{1-p^{(e_l)}}|F^{(e_l)}\rangle_{ab}|0\rangle_\pi + \sum_{l=1}^{d}\alpha_l\sum_{k=1}^{N}\sqrt{q_k^{(e_l)}}|e_l\rangle_a|R_k^{(e_l)}\rangle_b|k\rangle_\pi. \tag{19}$$

On the other hand, Eqs. (16) and (17) imply

$$U|\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b|\chi\rangle_\pi = \sqrt{1-p^{(\psi)}}|F^{(\psi)}\rangle_{ab}|0\rangle_\pi + \sum_{k=1}^{N}\sum_{l=1}^{d}\alpha_l\sqrt{q_k^{(\psi)}}|e_l\rangle_a|R_k^{(\psi)}\rangle_b|k\rangle_\pi. \tag{20}$$

Since $\{|k\rangle_\pi\}_{k=0}^{N}$ and $\{|e_l\rangle_a\}_{l=1}^{d}$ are orthonormal bases, it is straightforward to see that both Eqs. (19) and (20) can be valid only if

$$q_k^{(e_l)} = q_k^{(\psi)}, \qquad |R_k^{(e_l)}\rangle_b = |R_k^{(\psi)}\rangle_b, \tag{21}$$

for all $l \in \{1,\ldots,d\}$ and all $k \in \{1,\ldots,N\}$. Since this result is independent of the input state $|\psi\rangle_a$ and of its orthogonal decomposition, it must be that $q_k^{(\psi)}$ and $|R_k^{(\psi)}\rangle_b$ do not depend on $|\psi\rangle_a$. Therefore,

$$q_k^{(\phi)} = q_k^{(\psi)}, \qquad |R_k^{(\phi)}\rangle_b = |R_k^{(\psi)}\rangle_b, \tag{22}$$

for all $|\psi\rangle_a, |\phi\rangle_a \in \mathcal{H}_a$ and $k \in \{1,2,\ldots,N\}$.

Moreover, applying Eq. (16) to $|\phi\rangle_a \in \mathcal{H}_a$, taking the inner product of $U|\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b|\chi\rangle_\pi$ and $U|\phi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_b|\chi\rangle_\pi$, and using Eq. (22) we obtain

$$\langle F^{(\phi)}|F^{(\psi)}\rangle = \langle\phi|\psi\rangle. \tag{23}$$

□

Details about the primed PBT protocol

In this section we provide specific details about the *primed* PBT protocol described in the main text, which achieves success probability q_j and satisfies Eq. (8) of the main text for the corresponding primed states,

$$\hat{\eta}_j' = \hat{\gamma}_{j,i}' = \frac{I}{2^n}. \tag{24}$$

We will use the identity given in the main text, which is satisfied for any quantum state $\hat{\rho}$ of dimension 2^n:

$$\frac{I}{2^n} \equiv \frac{1}{4^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n} V_l\hat{\rho}V_l^\dagger; \tag{25}$$

where we define the set of unitary operations $\{V_l\}_{l=1}^{4^n} \equiv \{\sigma_0,\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\sigma_3\}^{\otimes n}$, σ_0 is the identity acting on $\mathbb{C}^2$ and $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^{3}$ are the Pauli matrices.

The following, *primed*, PBT protocol achieves success probability q_j and satisfies Eq. (24).

Firstly, consider the stage previous to the implementation of PBT in which the resource state is prepared and distributed to Alice and Bob. An ancilla a' with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{a'}$ of dimension 4^n is prepared in the state $|\phi\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n}|\mu_l\rangle$, where $\{|\mu_l\rangle\}_{l=1}^{4^n}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{a'}$. Consider the resource state $|\xi\rangle_{AB}$ for the PBT protocol defined by Eqs. (3)–(5) of the main text. In the primed protocol, the controlled unitary $\sum_{l=1}^{4^n}(|\mu_l\rangle\langle\mu_l|)_{a'}\bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}(V_l)_{B_i}$ is applied on $|\phi\rangle_{a'}|\xi\rangle_{AB}$ in order to prepare the new resource state

$$|\xi'\rangle_{a'AB} \equiv \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n}\bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}(V_l)_{B_i}|\mu_l\rangle_{a'}|\xi\rangle_{AB}, \tag{26}$$

where $(V_l)_{B_i}$ acts on $\mathcal{H}_{B_i}$ only. The system $a'A$ is sent to Alice and the system B is sent to Bob. The initial state of system B_j in this protocol is $\hat{\eta}_j' \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{a'A\tilde{B}_j}(|\xi'\rangle\langle\xi'|)_{a'AB}$. From the definitions of $\hat{\eta}_j'$, $|\xi'\rangle$ and $\hat{\eta}_j$ (Eq. (11) of the main text), Eq. (25), and the fact that $\hat{\eta}_j$ is independent of $|\psi\rangle$, it is straightforward to obtain that

$$\hat{\eta}_j' = \frac{1}{4^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n} V_l\hat{\eta}_jV_l^\dagger = \frac{I}{2^n}, \tag{27}$$

as claimed.

Now consider the implementation of the primed PBT protocol. Alice applies the unitary operation $W_{aa'} \equiv \sum_{l=1}^{4^n}(V_l^\dagger)_a \otimes (|\mu_l\rangle\langle\mu_l|)_{a'}$ on the system aa', as the notation suggests. The global state transforms into

$$W_{aa'}|\psi\rangle_a|\xi\rangle_{a'AB} = \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n}(V_l^\dagger)_a \bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}(V_l)_{B_i}|\psi\rangle_a|\mu_l\rangle_{a'}|\xi\rangle_{AB}. \tag{28}$$

Then, Alice applies her operations corresponding to the PBT protocol defined by Eqs. (3)–(5) of the main text on the system aA only. With probability q_j, Alice obtains outcome $k = j \neq 0$. Due to the linearity of unitary evolution, it is not difficult to obtain that, in this case, the global state transforms into

$$|G'_j\rangle_{a'aAB} = \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n}\bigotimes_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N}(V_l)_{B_i}|\mu_l\rangle_{a'}|\psi\rangle_{B_j}|R_j\rangle_{aA\tilde{B}_j}. \tag{29}$$

Thus, we see that the state $|\psi\rangle$ is teleported to port B_j, as required. This protocol works because, as we can see from Eq. (28), the operations on system B commute with the operations performed by Alice on aA, which is necessary for satisfaction of the no-signaling principle. Therefore, this protocol is equivalent to the following: conditioned on a' being in the state $|\mu_l\rangle_{a'}$, if an outcome $k = j \neq 0$ is obtained, the state $V_l^\dagger|\psi\rangle$ is teleported to port B_j; then, Bob applies $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}(V_l)_{B_i}$, after which, the state of system B_j transforms into $|\psi\rangle$, as desired.

The state of system B_j, after an outcome $k = i \notin \{0, j\}$ is obtained, is $\hat{\gamma}'_{j,i} \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{a'aA\tilde{B}_j}(|G'_i\rangle\langle G'_i|)_{a'aAB}$. From the definitions of $\hat{\gamma}'_{j,i}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}$ (Eq. (12) of the main text), Eq. (25), and the fact that $\hat{\gamma}_{j,i}$ is independent of $|\psi\rangle$, it can easily be obtained that

$$\hat{\gamma}'_{j,i} = \frac{1}{4^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n} V_l \hat{\gamma}_{j,i} V_l^\dagger = \frac{I}{2^n}, \tag{30}$$

as claimed.

If Alice obtains the outcome $k = 0$, the final global state is

$$|G'_0\rangle_{a'aAB} = \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n}\bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}(V_l)_{B_i}|\mu_l\rangle_{a'}|F^{(\psi_l)}\rangle_{aAB}, \tag{31}$$

where ψ_l refers to dependence on the state $V_l^\dagger|\psi\rangle$. The final state of system B_j in this case is $\hat{\omega}_j'^{(\psi)} \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{a'aA\tilde{B}_j}\left(|G'_0\rangle\langle G'_0|\right)_{a'aAB}$. From the previous definition of $\hat{\omega}_j'^{(\psi)}$ and that one of $\hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi)}$, given by Eq. (13) of the main text, it is straightforward to obtain that

$$\hat{\omega}_j'^{(\psi)} = \frac{1}{4^n}\sum_{l=1}^{4^n} V_l \hat{\omega}_j^{(\psi_l)} V_l^\dagger, \tag{32}$$

as given in the main text.